

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,719	12/10/2001	Aleksandr O. Ryzhov	10018530-1	3647

7590 07/19/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,719

Applicant(s)

RYZHOV, ALEKSANDR O.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher et al. (US 6543011) in view of Gallo et al (US 6636246) in further view of Microsoft Windows NT.

In regards to claim 1, Schumacher teaches installing one or more keyboard and mouse event listeners to a Java application implemented in a window, wherein the one or more keyboard and mouse event listeners follows movements of a mouse cursor (i.e. "There are different listeners for each category of event in Java. For instance, the MouseListener interface defines methods such as MouseClicked, MousePressed, and MouseReleased. In order to receive events from a component, an object adds itself as a listener for that

Art Unit: 2174

component's events." Column 6, Line 14); Schumacher does not teach attaching a custom glass pane to the window, wherein the mouse cursor is located in the window, and displaying a drag image approximate the mouse cursor using the custom glass pane. Gallo teaches, "Referring now to FIG. 4, an elevational view of a glass pane overlaying a sensory cue 18 is shown generally as 50. Glass pane 52 is a transparent surface, which is positioned over sensory cue 18 and within the boundary of a portal 16. Glass pane 52 is an active surface, which allows for various functions such as highlighting, sketching, and copying from other documents." Column 7, Line 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schumacher with the teachings of Gallo and include a transparent glass pane to temporarily show the movement of the shadow movement of the window with the motivation to provide the user with an understanding of where the window is going to be placed. Schumacher and Gallo do not teach, wherein the drag image represents the dragged object and moves with the mouse cursor. Windows NT teaches displaying the semi-transparent image of an object that is being dragged wherein the image moves with the mouse cursor (See Figure 1, Element 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schumacher and Gallo with the teachings of Windows NT and include a method to show the shadow movement of an object with the motivation to give the user a better understanding of where the object is going to be moved to.

In regards to claim 2, Gallo teaches a method further comprising removing the custom glass pane from the window after the drag and drop operation (i.e. "Glass pane 52 can be cleared, at the user's option." Column 8, Line 2).

In regards to claim 3, Gallo teaches a method wherein the displaying step includes repainting the drag image using the custom glass pane (i.e. "As will be understood by those skilled in the art, the glass pane 52 may be implemented as a transparent texture upon which the user can paint." Column 7, Line 64).

In regards to claim 5, Schumacher teaches a method wherein the displaying step includes using a standard drag and drop application programming interface (API) specification (i.e. "In response to user input 610 on a component in applet 620, such as moving a mouse, a keystroke, or a drag operation, an event 630 is constructed and posted on system queue 650. System queue 650 then dispatches this event to any applet listeners 640 on that component. The component's applet listeners 640 execute tasks according to the properties of event 630." Column 6, Line 31).

In regards to claim 6, Schumacher teaches a method wherein the installing step includes installing the one or more keyboard and mouse event listeners at a global application level (Figure 6, Element 640).

In regards to claim 7, Gallo teaches a method further comprising saving a currently installed glass pane in a storage device before attaching the custom glass pane to the window (i.e. "Should the user wish to have the current window saved as a new sensory cue 18 then a snapshot of the sensory cue is taken at step 126 and saved to be displayed in portal 16. At step 128 the associated

Art Unit: 2174

application is closed and the new sensory cue 18 is displayed in portal 16."

Column 10, Line 28).

Claim 9 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 4, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher et al. (US 6543011), Gallo et al (US 6636246) and Microsoft Windows NT in further view of Doyle et al. (US 5251322).

In regards to claim 4, Schumacher, Gallo, and Microsoft Windows NT teach all the limitations of claim 1. They do not teach a method wherein the displaying step comprises: detaching the custom glass pane from a previous window; and attaching the custom glass pane to a next window where the mouse cursor is currently located. Doyle teaches, "A client process 100 will call this routine to attach or detach a window (3DDC) to or from a graphics context (3DGC)." Column 50, Line 54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schumacher, Gallo, and Windows NT and include a method to detach and reattach a window with the motivation to achieve a high performance graphics workstation (Doyle, Column 2, Line 17).

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 8, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher et al. (US 6543011), Gallo et al (US 6636246) and Microsoft Windows NT in further view of Berquist et al. (US 6151021).

In regards to claim 8, Schumacher, Gallo, and Microsoft Windows NT teach all the limitations of claim 1. They do not teach a method further comprising reattaching a previously saved glass pane to the window after removing the

Art Unit: 2174

custom glass pane from the window after the drag and drop operation. Berquist teaches, "Thus, when the first note 914 is attached to the active window 906, the first note 914 becomes active, and when the first note 914 is attached to the inactive window 908, the first note 914 becomes inactive. When the first note 914, which is inactive on the inactive window 908, is reattached to the desktop 910, the first note 914 remains inactive." Column 15, Line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schumacher, Gallo, and Microsoft Windows NT with the teachings of Berquist and include a method to reattach previously saved windows, or glass panes, after a drag and drop operation with the motivation to provide the user with more flexibility handling different objects.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The

Art Unit: 2174

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100